Comment Letter I110

February 26, 2014

To: County of San Diego

Planning and Development Services

Project Processing Counter

5510 Overland Ave, suite 110

San Diego, CA 92123

Re: COMMENTS ON

SOITEC SOLAR DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PIER)

SOITEC SOLAR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ENVIRNMENTAL IIMPACT REPORT, LOG NO.PDS2012-3910-120005 (ER); 3800-12-010 (GPA); TIERRA DEL SOL, 3300-12-010 (MUP); 3600-12-005 (REZ); 3921-77-046-01 (AP); RUGGED SOLAR, 3300-12-007 (MUP); SCH NO.2012121018

From: Rose Jackson

41148 Old Highway 80

Boulevard, Ca, 91905

Director and Staff;

I and my family own property and live in Boulevard. We are concerned about the inevitable negative effects that bulldozing the life out of 1473 acres in our neighborhood will bring.

Hello, my name is Rose Jackson and I am opposed to Soitec for many reasons.



Response to Comment Letter I110

Rose Jackson February 28, 2014

I110-1 The County of San Diego acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project. The information in this comment will be in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report for review and consideration by the decision makers.

I110-1

October 2015 7345

1. The construction of a Security fence less than 5 miles from the Cleveland National forest is illegal because it stops the natural migration of wild animals example Mrs. Mountain lion cannot get to see Mr. Mountain Lion. SOIETIEC CLAIMING NOT TO HARM ANY THREATENED OR ENDANGERED ANIMALS IS TRULY LUDICRIOUS I still remember when I was a child and my family would go to Pine Valley to see the snow. There were wild tourtoises and I asked my father if I could bring one home but he said I could not. I haven't seen one of them for years.

I110-2

I110-2

The security fence is also a fire hazard in a location that is prone to fires. For example-While trying to put out a fire; Heavy equipment must re route for a fire.

I am also opposed to the project for unnessary water usage in a drout; putting poluted water without making sure the cleaning material is disposed of properly. Your local car service station must comply with this law.

I110-3

Rose Jackson

Potential adverse effects related to wildlife movement are considered and discussed in the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR); refer to Section 2.3.3.4, Wildlife Movement and Nursery Sites. Please also refer to response to comment F1-13 concerning habitat fragmentation and potential impacts to wildlife corridors from the development of the Rugged solar farm.

Potential adverse effects related to fire hazards are considered and discussed in the DPEIR; refer to Section 3.1.4.3.3, Wildfire Hazards. In addition, the fire protection plans provide measures to reduce the risk of fire on the site and ensure emergency response access in the case of a fire (see Appendices 3.1.4-5 and 3.1.4-6 to the DPEIR).

Potential adverse effects related to groundwater use and water quality are considered and addressed in the DPEIR; refer to Sections 3.1.5.3, Surface Water and Groundwater Quality; 3.1.5.3, Groundwater Resources; and 3.1.9.3, Water, of the DPEIR. See also common response WR1.

October 2015 7345